

with Canada if we say enforce the law. Enforce the law.

I made that statement to Mr. Zoellick privately and in the Finance Committee hearings, and I am going to do so when he is confirmed. I thought Charlene Barshefsky of the previous administration was a good U.S. Trade Representative up until the last year. Then I think she was overrun by the election year and the State Department and all kinds of other people. I think she was tougher than most Trade Representatives. Overall, she did a good job, particularly in the high-tech area.

In agriculture, she was not quite so good. But I am worried. I have supported all of these trade agreements we voted on over the years—GATT, NAFTA, Africa and CBI trade, and China PNTR. But I am getting really fed up with the way we are being treated by our trading partners. I am even more fed up with the way our administrations don't insist on the laws being enforced. So I have urged Mr. Zoellick to do that. I believe he will. I hope he will. If he does not, I can assure him and this administration and our trading partners that a strong letter to follow and action will be taken to be commensurate with how I feel about this issue.

We have to have some change in how we deal with our trading partners. Now is the time, at the beginning of a new administration. Without being overly critical, it has been both Republican and Democrat administrations. It is time we look after American interests in the trade area as well as in the diplomatic, economic, and military areas.

I know others will say things such as this, and in the Finance Committee some of my friends on the Democratic side were surprised to hear me say this and liked it. I don't mean to sound as if I am some sort of a traditional protectionist, but fair is fair. I don't think our trading partners are dealing with us fairly right now.

I support this nomination, and I will urge a vote for his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

#### TAX CUTS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will say to the majority leader that I think his last set of remarks may be the basis of bipartisanship between the two of us. We will keep this civil.

I will also say to the majority leader and others that I can't wait for the debate because he focuses on the \$30,000-a-year family. But anybody who looks at the distribution of benefits of President Bush's tax cut plan will see—I don't know—40 percent of the benefit going to the top 1 percent of the top 5 percent, which is ridiculous. It is like Robin Hood in reverse. Yes, we will make sure there is a set of tax credits to go to middle-income and working-income families. Absolutely.

I will point out one more time—and I didn't hear the majority leader respond to this at all—I want to hold President Bush accountable for these numbers—a \$3.1 trillion non-Social Security surplus becomes 2.6 when you put Medicare trust money aside, which we will do. It becomes \$2 trillion when extending tax credits, and we also provide payments to farmers and other people, which we will do without doubt. The tax cuts go from \$1.6 trillion to \$2 trillion, when you now have to pay the interest on the debt, when you are not paying the debt down, in which case I want to know where are the resources to leave no child behind.

I say to the majority leader that I am more than willing to debate after we provide tax cuts for middle-income working families, whether or not we, in fact, provide some benefits so elderly people can afford prescription drugs versus tax cuts for the wealthy, whether we can expand health care coverage versus tax cuts, or whether or not we will live up to the words of leaving no child behind and make investment in child care and in Head Start and in our schools and fund the IDEA program versus tax cuts for the wealthy.

I think the message President Bush is trying to convey and the majority leader echoes to the people in the country—I all of a sudden find myself being a fiscal conservative—is that we can do it all. There is no free lunch. We can't do it all. We can't have tax cuts disproportionately to the wealthy, erode the revenue base, and at the same time say we are going to leave no child behind; we are going to make an investment in education; we are going to make an investment in covering prescription drugs for the elderly. We can't do both. The people in the country are smart enough to figure that out, and I hope Democrats will engage this administration. The sooner the better. I don't think we need to wait one more day to have this debate.

Senators and President Bush: You cannot proclaim the vision and the value of leaving no child behind and keep this on a tin cup budget. If we are real about this, we will make the investment in the intellect, the skills, and the character of our children.

This budget is not real. It does not make that commitment to leaving no child behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### AIRLINE INDUSTRY COMPETITION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, a key principle of economic competition today is that one big merger begets another. Known as copycat mergers, these deals are made when the companies that did not merge first felt forced to copy the initial merger. If those left behind do not merge, then they just can't keep up with the Joneses.

This morning, I am going to focus for a few minutes on competition in the airline industry. I want to begin by saying that when it comes to copycat airline mergers, this country has reached the point where there are virtually no more cats.

This weekend, Americans opened their newspapers to learn that Delta Airlines, the nation's third largest carrier, and Continental, have begun merger discussions. The Associated Press says that Delta and Continental don't even really want to merge. But you guessed it—they say other major airline mergers might drive them to it.

The latest round of airline merger reports comes on the heels of the proposed United-U.S. Airways merger and American's proposed deals with TWA and United.

In my opinion, if nothing is done in the face of these proposed airline mergers, our country is headed down a runway of no return. If this lineup of mergers takes off, it will destroy the last remnants of competition in the airline history.

The trend toward concentration in the airline industry did not begin in the last few weeks. More than 20 consecutive airline mergers were approved in the 1980s.

I believe much of the problem we are seeing today stems from that huge array of airline mergers that took place in the 1980s. In fact, I think the merger between TWA and Ozark sets in motion the trend that began in the 1980s. I come to the floor this morning to say I believe it is time to change course.

The central problem stems from the fact that the major proponents of deregulation have not been willing to simultaneously and vigorously enforce the antitrust laws. As a result, our country gets the worst of both worlds: dominant companies with a choke hold on the market, and nobody setting rules to make sure they don't run roughshod over the American consumer—the flying public.

The Justice Department, which has been run by officials from both political parties since concentration in the airline industry accelerated, has not fully utilized the antitrust tools at its disposal. As a result, I want to make a proposal this morning: Before the Justice Department clears one more major airline merger, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) should have to make a public report demonstrating that the merger will not have negative long-term implications for consumers and the economy. The FTC should dig in, hold public hearings to examine these deals, and get to the bottom of the long-term consequences of these airline mergers. It is time to make sure that these mergers don't strand any more airline passengers with too few choices and too many headaches.

The real question is: Is competition in the airline industry working today?